REMARKS

Claims 1-22 were rejected. Claims 1-7, 9-19, and 21-22, are presently pending. Claims 8 and 20 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 14, 16, and 21 have been amended.

Claim 11 was objected to because of informalities. Applicants have amended claim 11 as suggested by Examiner and request withdrawal of the objection.

Claims 1-7, 9-19, and 21-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0094777 ("Cannon").

Amendments to Claims 1, 7, and 16

Claims 1, 7, and 16 have been amended to include "receiving a request for access to the computer network from a client terminal" and further "determining whether a mobile terminal is within a predetermined location, said mobile terminal being separate from the client terminal".

Applicants respectfully submit that Cannon does not teach or fairly suggest "said mobile terminal being separate from the client terminal". Examiner has indicated that "Cannon teaches receiving a request to access a computer network, via the user of a password and GPS coordinates. See paragraphs 39 and 40. Cannon al also teach determining whether the mobile is within a predetermined location in paragraph 40, lines 5+…". Office Action at 2.

However, Cannon teaches that "Received GPS location coordinates received from wireless piconet network devices

<u>requesting authorization</u> are compared to the boundary coordinates 602 by the earth coordinates authorization module 600 to determine whether or not <u>the requesting wireless piconet device is within the predetermined secured area</u>." Cannon, Paragraph 40 (Emphasis Added). Accordingly Cannon does not teach or fairly suggest the "mobile terminal being separate from the client terminal."

Examiner is requested to remove the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) to claims 1, 7, and 16, as well as dependent claims 2-6, 9-15, 17-19, and 20-21.

Claims 4, 5, 12, 14, and 21

Claims 4, 12, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 4 and 12 have been amended to include "receiving a password <u>displayed on the mobile terminal</u>". Claims 5, 14, and 21 add further that the password is a "time varying randomly generated alpha numeric number."

Examiner indicates that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have generated/displayed a randomly generated, time varying password for each user in Cannon, et. al., in light of the teachings of AAPA, in order to provide a means for further enhancing the security of the system in Cannon, et. al." Applicants respectfully traverse.

Even if Cannon teaches "the use of a password" and in the admitted prior art, "some computer systems use a time varying randomly generated password for each authorized user" Office Action p. 3-4, Applicants respectfully submit

that neither Cannon or the AAPA teach "receiving a password displayed on the mobile terminal."

Moreover, Examiner indicates that Cannon teaches determining whether the mobile is within a predetermined location in paragraph 40, lines 5+, "Received GPS location coordinates from wireless piconet network devices requesting authorization". As can be seen, it would actually reduce security to display a password on the mobile terminal. Accordingly, neither Cannon or the AAPA teach or fairly suggest "receiving a password displayed on the mobile terminal". Examiner is requested to withdraw the rejection to claims 4, 5, 12, 14, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, each of the pending claims in the present application are allowable, making the application in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

Mirut P. Dalal
ATTORNEY FOR ASSIGNEE
Reg. No. 44,052

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison – Suite 3400
Chicago, IL 60661

Voice (312) 775-8000
FAX   (312) 775-8100